(4000 ft ), 9-4-1895, *s.l.* 965 (Acc. No. 170282, CAL).

### ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Thanks are due to Dr. A. N. Henry and Mr. M. Chandrabose, Botanical Survey of India, Coimbatore for suggestions; and to Mr. V. S. Ramachandran, Botanical Survey of India, Coimbatore for confirming the identity at CAL.

N. C. NAIR AND S. R. SRINIVASAN

*Botanical Survey of India, Coimbatore*

### REFERENCES

GAMBLE, J. S. XXX—Decades Kewenses Plantarum Novarum in Herbario Horti Regii Conservatarum. Decas XCI. *Kew Bull.* 1918 : 239. 1918.

HENRY, A. N., K. VIVEKANANTHAN AND N. C. NIAR. Rare and threatened flowering plants of South India. *Journ. Bombay nat. Hist. Soc.* 75 : 684-697. 1978 (1979).

## ON THE STATUS OF SOME ENDEMICS (?) IN INDIA—I

Consequent on detailed monographic work and fuller knowledge of distribution, plants hitherto considered endemic turn out to be wide spread. Some such examples of orchids, which are based on mainly Seidenfaden's revisions (1975, 1976, 1977) of *Cleisostoma* Bl., *Liparis* L. C. Rich. and *Habenaria* Willd. are discussed here.

**Cleisostoma discolor** Lindl. Bot. Reg. 31. Misc. 59. 1845.

Hooker (1890), while treating the Orchidaceae in flora of British India, mentioned three species namely, *C. discolor* Lindl. from India (without definite locality), *Sarcanthus macrodon* Reichb. f. (Gard. Chron. 1555. 1872) from Madras Presidency, and *Saccolabium rostellatum* Hook. f. from Darjeeling.

Seidenfaden (1975) found that *Sarcanthus macrodon* and *Saccolabium rostellatum* as also another species *Sarcanthus auriculatus* Rolfe (Kew Bull. 9. 1895), also from India (without definite locality), are indistinguishable from *C. discolor* and thus reduced them to synonymy under *C. discolor.* Furthermore, he cited *Sarcanthus angkorensis* Guillaum (Bull. Soc. Bot. Fr. 77: 328. 1930) from Cambodia, *S. josephii* J. J. Sm. (Bull. Butenz. 2S. 9: 108. 1913) and *S. termissus* Reichb. f. (Hamb. Gartenz. 16: 15. 1860) both from Java, as synonyms of *C. discolor.* His treatment has affected the endemic status of some Indian taxa. All the above mentioned endemic species cannot be considered as endemics. Now, *C. discolor* is to be regarded as ranging from India to Cambodia, Thailand, Malaya, Sumatra and Java.

**Habenaria khasiana** Hook. f. Fl. Brit. Ind. 6: 151. 1890.

This species was based on a collection from Meghalaya-Khasi hills and was believed to be endemic to India. Seidenfaden (1977) treated *H. graminifolia* Gagnep. (Bull. Soc. Bot. Fr. 78: 70. 1931), a species from Cambodia, as a synonym under *H. khasiana.*

In view of this the distribution of *H. khasiana* now extends from India to Thailand, Laos and Cambodia and it cannot be considered as an endemic species.

**Liparis campylostalix** Reich. f. Linnaea 41: 45. 1877.

This was described from India (locality not known) and was, for sometime, considered to be an endemic species. Seidenfaden (1976) listed *L. giraldiana* Krazl. (Beibl. 82, Bot. Jahrb. 36: 28. 1905) and *L. pauciflora* Rolfe (Kew Bull. 193. 1896), both from China, as synonyms under *L. campylostalix.*

Now, the disribuion of *L. campylostalix* extends from India to China.

**Liparis perpusilla** Hook. f. Ic. Pl. T. 1856 B. 1889; Fl. Brit. Ind. 5. 706. 1890.

Hooker described this species from Sikkim Himalaya.

Tuyama (in Fl. E. Himal. 441. 1966) establisned a new species *L. tongashii* Tuyama from Nepal. In his later work (Tuyama, 1971), he found that *L. tongashii* and *L. perpusilla* are conspecific. Thus, he treated *L. tongashii* as a synonym.

The range of distribution of *L. perpusilla* extends from India to Nepal and it cannot be considered as strictly endemic to India.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I am greatly indebted to Dr. S. K. Jain, Director, Botanical Survey of India for discussions and for going through the manuscript; also to the Government of India (BSI) for award of a fellowship.

AJAY MEHROTRA
*Botanical Survey of India, Howrah*

## REFERENCES

HOOKER, J. D. Orchidaceae in Flora of British India Part. 17 : 1-224. 1890.

SEIDENFADEN, G. Orchid genera in Thailand. I-III. *Dansk Bot. Arkiv.* 29 (2-4) : 1-224. 1975.

—— Idem. IV. *Liparis* L. C. Rich. *Ibid.* 33(1) : 1-105. 1976.

—— Idem. V. *Ibid.* 31(3) : 1-147. 1977.

TUYAMA, T. Orchidaceae in H. Hara (ed.) The Flora of Eastern Himalaya. Second report. 176-196. Univ. Tokyo. Press. Tokyo 1971.

## A NOTE ON THE RARE PLANT *OIANTHUS DISCIFLORUS* HOOK. F.

*Oianthus* Benth. (Asclepiadaceae) a genus endemic to India is represented by four species (Willis, Dict. Fl. Pl. Ferns Rev. A. K. Airy Shaw 1973). Of these only a single species (*O. beddomei* Hook. f.) has been so far reported from the erstwhile Presidency of Madras (Gamble, Fl. Pres. Madras. 1923). The rest of the species namely, *O. deccanensis* Talbot, *O. disciflorus* Hook. f. and *O. urceolatus* Benth. are recorded only from Western India.

Hooker f. in Flora of British India (1883) doubted the occurrence of *O. disciflorus* Hook. f. in Concan. Nairne (1894) did not include it in 'The Flowering Plants of Western India'. Cooke (Fl. Pres. Bombay, 1904) remarked that there are two sheets in the herbarium at Kew (K). Each of the sheets is lebelled "Kanara and Mysore, Law" with an interrogation mark and each also bearing the ticket "Konkan, Stocks". None of the labels was in the handwriting of either Law or Stocks. Cooke therefore concluded that its occurrence in Western India is doubtful. Talbot in the Forest Flora of Bombay Presidency and Sind (1911) remarked that this is an apparently very rare plant, very doubtfully indigenous within the limits of the former Bombay Presidency.

Santapau and Irani (Univ. Bomb. bot. Mem. 4: 65-66. 1960) could not collect this species but they confirm that the plant was collected after Cooke's flora and Santapau had taken photographs of several sheets collected by T. R. Bell at Karwar on 25.7.1933, bearing the number 107. No further information about the plant is available in literature and it is therefore presumably an extremely rare plant.

An unidentified specimen (*s.l.* 1917) from Kurnool district in Andhra Pradesh has been discovered in MH and this turned out to be *O. disciflorus* Hook. f. There is an exactly similar specimen at CAL (Coll. T. R. Bell from Karwar in 1933). In all probability this is one of the duplicate of Bell's collection at Kew. After Bell, the only collection is that of J. L. Ellis from Gundla-